2002

Attorney's Docket No.: 09125-001001 / D2

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Barrows et al.

Art Unit : 1653

Examiner: J. Russel

Serial No.: 09/185,732 Filed

Title

: November 4, 1998

: ADHESIVE SEALANT COMPOSITION

FAX RECEIVED

Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

RESPONSE

GROUP 1600

In response to the action mailed July 14, 2000, please amend the application as follows:

REMARKS

The following is responsive to the Examiner's action mailed July 14, 2000. Claims 300-440 stand rejected based on the recapture rate. The rejection relies on the following passage from In re Clement:

> [I]f the reissue claims is as broad or broader in an aspect germane to a prior art rejection, but narrower in another aspect completely unrelated to the rejection, the recapture rule bars the claims... In re Clement 131 F.3d 7464, 1467 (Fed./Cir. 1997).

First, the rejection reasons that the reissue/claims limited to "albumin protein" are broader than claims cancelled in the original prosecution because original claim 2, a dependent claim, which recited "serum albumin protein", was cancelled during the original prosecution.

But the subject matter of claim 2 was not cancelled. The subject matter of original claim 2 was simply incorporated into independent claim 1\ At most, it is original claim 1, not limited to any protein, that was cancelled by the amendment.

Second, the rejection notes that the reissue claims are as broad or broader than cancelled claim 1 with regard to protein and crosslinking ascent concentrations and burst strength. The

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY FIRST CLASS MAIL

I hereby certify under 37 CFR §1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage on the date indicated below and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231.

Date of Deposit

Signature

Typed or Printed Name of Person Signing Certificate